

DU 627

·4

·S4

27

4

3/ 98 J. F. Shafroth 2 over
DU627 H. F. R
4
54

AN IMPERIAL POLICY DANGEROUS
TO THE REPUBLIC.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHAFROTH,

OF COLORADO,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1898.

WASHINGTON.

1898.

第 13



P.
Mr. W. A. Smith

68611



DU 627
4
54

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHAFROTH.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States—

Mr. SHAFROTH said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is with feelings of the gravest apprehension that I find in this House a sentiment concerning the future foreign policy of this Government which has just found expression in the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER]. He has boldly declared that the United States should enter upon a policy of acquiring colonial possessions; that it should not only annex Hawaii but should extend its power and dominion across the Pacific and forever hold possession of the Philippine Islands.

Sir, he but voices the sentiment of four-fifths of those Representatives who believe in the annexation of Hawaii.

On the day the vote was taken to consider this resolution, in order to test the extent of this sentiment, I put the question to twelve Hawaiian annexationists of this House, whether they believed also in annexing the Philippine Islands. In every instance I received an affirmative answer. I am satisfied that to-day such a policy for this Government would be carried by a large majority in this body. The question has gone beyond that of merely annexing Hawaii and is now whether we will adopt an imperial policy for this Republic.

Sir, if any person six weeks ago had suggested that the policy which this Government has pursued with such magnificent results for the last one hundred years should be reversed and that we should extend our dominion to the Asiatic continent, he would have been regarded as a dreamer unfit to represent the people of any State in the Union. And yet the excitement of war has produced such a desire for conquest that the Representatives set no limit or bound to the extent of our dominion.

Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss this resolution from three standpoints:

First, from the political standpoint;

Second, from the commercial standpoint; and

Third, from the military standpoint.

I.—FROM THE POLITICAL STANDPOINT.

What I mean by political standpoint is not as it affects one political party or the other, but as it affects the general policy and welfare of the United States. Under a system of acquiring territory only on this continent, which in no manner involves us in the political controversies of the European powers, we have built up the greatest nation on the face of the globe. No longer can even the greatest European nation be compared to the United States. It is proper now to contrast this country only with groups of nations, or with the balance of the world. In commerce, manufacture, mining, and agriculture we are equal to between one-third and one-half of the balance of the world.

The nations whose policy has been to acquire colonial possessions have not made such rapid progress.

WHY THE UNITED STATES BECAME RICH AND POWERFUL.

Why have we advanced so rapidly? At the time of the formation of our Government we possessed practically none of the accumulated wealth that made the European nations important, and yet without an equal start we have far surpassed them in wealth and in all the industries that make a nation truly great.

The reason of our immense achievement lies in the fact that the position of our territory naturally isolates us from the political quarrels of the Eastern Continent.

With no rival to the north or the south on this hemisphere, with no contiguous foe we need fear, we have not been required to tax ourselves to death for the purpose of sustaining a large standing army and an immense navy. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of an ample navy and have always so voted, but I am not in favor of undertaking a policy that will necessitate two and three times as large a navy as would be required for the most ample protection of our territory as now constituted. A colonial policy means enormously increased standing army and navy and millions to be spent on fortifications of distant harbors.

In an interview of a few weeks ago Señor Sagasta, the Spanish premier, said:

Our colonies have cost us dear. Within the last twenty-five years we have spent in them 3,000,000 000 francs in defensive works. Only the most important cities and points have been fortified, as we could not erect works everywhere. The cost would have been 7,000,000,000 or 8,000,000,000 francs.

Germany also finds colonies to be expensive. Her experience in this respect was recently stated in the Boertsen Courier, of Berlin, as follows:

A heavy burden has been laid upon Germany by her colonial policy. About 11,000,000 marks are spent annually in this connection, and a further expendi-

ture may be looked for in the future. The revenue derived from the colonies in no way offsets this expenditure.

Great armies and navies appeal to the national pride when comparing the prowess of nations, yet it must be remembered that the chief end of government is the happiness of the subject, and subjects can not be happy when burdened with taxation for maintaining unnecessarily large armies and navies. Such a course affects not only the happiness of the citizen, but prevents great development and cripples the industries of a nation. It strips the productive forces of a country in order to supply men for the army. In order to maintain this warlike array the taxes of England are 10 per cent of the earnings of her people; of France, 13 per cent; of Germany, 10½ per cent, while those of the United States, under our policy, are only 5 per cent. The wars of Europe in the past century have directly or indirectly cost more than \$100,000,000,000. That is the reason Europe has not prospered as we have. Do we want to change that natural advantage which our position gives and enter upon a policy that will involve us in controversies with foreign powers and necessitate the placing of the same burdens upon our people as are now borne by the nations of Europe?

For a time the glittering sight of marshaled men may stimulate our pride and make us enthusiastic for such an array, but when we realize that the cost of indulging that national pride must be paid by the sweat of labor, with its inevitable result of preventing development and crippling industries, the wise course of maintaining our natural advantage becomes apparent.

No better advice was ever given than that of Washington in his Farewell Address, when he said:

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not legally hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

Mr. Jefferson, in his inaugural address of 1801, announced the following rule:

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none.

SHALL WE ABANDON THE MONROE DOCTRINE?

This annexation policy which seems to so thoroughly pervade this House means the abandonment of the Monroe doctrine. That doctrine is simply that European governments should not extend their territory on this hemisphere, and reciprocally that we should not extend our dominion beyond the same.

Mr. Speaker, in this Hall two years ago, I witnessed a scene which I shall never forget. It was at the time of the dispute between this country and Great Britain over the Venezuelan boundary. The President sent a message to Congress, which with ringing words declared that the Monroe doctrine should be maintained; that no European power should be permitted to acquire territory on this side of the Atlantic. There was universal applause following the reading of that message. The feeling of Congress partook of the same character as that which manifested itself at the time of the passage of the bill appropriating \$50,000,000 for the defense of the nation. With no dissenting voice it was said that the Monroe doctrine was most essential to our Government and must be upheld.

The result of that message made the Monroe doctrine international law. After that firm message England discovered that the Monroe doctrine was the same principle applied to this continent that she had exercised repeatedly as to the Eastern Hemisphere, namely, the doctrine of the balance of power. She conceded that if she had the right to enforce that doctrine as to the Eastern Continent, we had the right to enforce it as to the Western.

For one hundred years we have been trying to get the nations of the world to recognize this principle, and at last it is an accomplished fact. Yet, the minute we get this cherished principle firmly established and recognized, we by our own volition destroy it.

Sir, we have no right to invoke that doctrine against the acquisition of territory on this continent by European nations, and at the same time violate the doctrine by the acquisition of territory on the eastern continent. We must either keep hands off the Eastern Hemisphere, or permit European nations to acquire territory in this continent. One is the correlative of the other.

To my mind there is no comparison as to which is the better policy for this Government. The one continues the policy of peace, of making this the greatest of all commercial nations, and of developing all the varied industries of the same.

The other is a policy of military aggrandizement, which is not suited to the principles of a republic, and not consonant with the liberty of the individual.

There are weaknesses in republics that disqualify them from becoming warlike nations. The discipline of an army is the exercise of the powers of monarchy. The conduct of a campaign is absolute monarchy.

To gain advantages in preparing for and declaring war, secrets must be made of important facts, which can never be done under republican institutions. Good government in a republic is the result of the greatest latitude of investigation by the public. To depart from that course would open the Pandora box of evils which would jeopardize the very existence of the republic.

Mr. Speaker, others may be willing under an impulse generated by war to declare that they will abandon the doctrine that has been recognized not only by one, but by all political parties as the true and wise policy for this Government; but I for one can not. I can not persuade myself that such a course is for the best interest of my country.

OTHER POLITICAL PROBLEMS.

In the annexation of the Hawaiian or Philippine islands other political questions arise that are almost as momentous and as fatal to our institutions as the doctrine of military aggrandizement. The Hawaiian and Philippine islands are located in a latitude south of the Tropic of Cancer. Sir, there is something in the climate of the torrid zone that saps the energies of man and prevents that development so essential to good and enlightened citizenship of a republic. The civilization of a people is largely the result of climatic influences, and hence it is almost impossible, if not an impossibility, to change the civilization of the countries situated near the equator. The Sandwich Islands have a population of 109,000, of which 24,407 are Japanese; 21,616, Chinese; 15,191, Portuguese; 39,504, native Hawaiians; 4,116, other foreigners, and 3,036, Americans. The Philippine Islands have a greater percentage of Asiatic population.

Why, sir, what are we going to do with these or the Philippine Islands if they are annexed to the United States? Are we going to admit them as States? You must remember they belong to an entirely different civilization, to an entirely different race. They know nothing of republican institutions.

Are we going to give these people the right of local self-government? The answer is no; and it is not contended that they are capable of self-government. Yet are we going to violate the very principle for which our fathers fought the Revolutionary war? Are we now going to deny the principle that "taxation without representation is tyranny?"

The Constitution of the United States declares that no person shall be deprived of the right of citizenship on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. Speaker, when territory is added to this nation, we are bound to give the inhabitants thereof the right of citizenship, or to overturn the guaranty of the Constitution. What does local self-government or admission to statehood mean as to these islands? It means a race problem. We have had one race problem, which almost destroyed republican institutions in some of the States of this Union. That was one in which the races were nearly equally divided in such States. How much more serious must be the problem where the proportion against our own race is more than 15 to 1?

Consequently, the admission of Hawaii or the Philippine Islands will bring to us nothing but discord, discontent, and a large expenditure of money. In my judgment it will result in no good to the nation.

Is it possible that it is wise policy to add to our country the same Asiatic inhabitants against whom the people of the Pacific coast once rose in their wrath and compelled the enactment of laws excluding them from our shores?

The song of "Come along, John Chinaman, we've room enough to welcome all," was once sung with a degree of enthusiasm that indicated a unanimity of sentiment favorable to such immigration. And yet, sir, when the practicable application of the sentiment was felt, it produced such a revulsion in the public mind that had not speedy restrictive legislation followed it would have produced domestic disturbances that might have culminated even in revolution. Is it possible that it is wise to again put republican institutions to such a severe test?

The foundation upon which republics are founded is the education of its citizens. It is in recognition of this principle that we have established the public-school system and spent millions and millions of dollars in educating our children. It is said that anarchy can never prevail among educated people, and it is true. Are we now to ignore that principle and run the hazards of revolt which all history shows must surely follow from ignorant citizenship?

Besides, sir, by annexation of the Hawaiian Islands we are violating another fundamental principle of our Government. "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." The Dole administration does not even pretend to represent the wishes of the people of Hawaii on this question. A monster petition against annexation, signed by more than a majority of the Hawaiians, has been presented to the Senate. No one has contended in this debate that a majority of the inhabitants

desire annexation. The annexationists dare not adopt an amendment to this resolution providing for annexation upon a vote of the people of those islands. Is it possible that our Government that pretends to derive its jurisdiction over people from the consent of the governed are, as against a friendly people, going to annex them without their consent? We may have the power, but it is not wise to exercise it.

I therefore contend that from a political standpoint it will be an egregious blunder for this Government to enter upon an imperial policy, or to make a start therein by annexing the Hawaiian Islands.

II.—FROM THE COMMERCIAL STANDPOINT.

I wish now to examine this question from the commercial standpoint. In doing this, I will consider it only from the standpoint of benefit to our country, not as it affects the people of the Hawaiian or Philippine islands. Do we get the best of the bargain?

This is the first time I have ever heard that it is to our commercial advantage to annex islands when the balance of trade with them is against us to the extent of ten millions a year—when they sell us three times as much as we sell them.

We imported from Hawaii in 1896 products of the value of \$15,460,098 and exported products of the value of \$5,464,208, leaving the balance of trade against us to the extent of \$9,995,890.

The balance of trade against us is not the worst feature of our commerce with those islands. Ninety-nine per cent of those imports is sugar, every pound of which should be raised on American soil and by American labor. The Hawaiian Islands in 1897 imported into this country the enormous amount of 502,000,000 pounds of sugar. Sir, that is sufficient to supply with that commodity all the people in the United States residing west of the Missouri River. When these islands are once annexed, the sugar industry there will increase even more rapidly than it has in the past, and in the last twenty-five years the imports of sugar have increased almost in a geometrical ratio, being 25,080,182 pounds in 1875 and 443,569,282 pounds in 1893.

Mr. Speaker, is it possible that we want to put those people in active competition with the people who are native-born Americans?

Mr. BRUCKER. Have we not done that by the reciprocity treaty?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I concede that that has been done by the reciprocity treaty, and it has been done at a cost of \$65,000,000 to your constituents and mine. [Applause.]

Mr. BRUCKER. And yet at the same time the gentleman will not say that he is in favor of the repeal of that treaty?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I must say that I do not believe that treaty ought to exist. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The annexation of these islands means the absolute destruction of the sugar industry in the Western States. It means depriving the already overburdened farmer of the privilege of raising a product which promises to yield him some return for his labor.

Why he can not compete with Hawaiian sugar is because it is there raised by contract Chinese and Japanese labor that is paid \$3 a month and board, or 30 cents a day without board. In the Philippine Islands the labor conditions are still worse. Is it any wonder that Mr. Gompers, the president of the Federation of Labor of the United States, is fighting with all his might the annexation of the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands.

Therefore I maintain that from a commercial standpoint annexation would be to the detriment of our trade balance, to the destruction of our sugar industry, and to the injury of our laborers.

III.—FROM A MILITARY STANDPOINT.

Mr. Speaker, I desire now to discuss the proposition from a military standpoint.

I take it as a general proposition that the consensus of opinions of statesmen is that solidarity of territory presents the most invulnerable form of possessions. No better demonstration of this can be found than in the present war with Spain. We have made the attack upon Spain, where? Not on her home territory. If this war were waged upon her home territory it would take ten times the number of men and ten times the amount of money to produce the same result we are now accomplishing.

We have attacked Spain at her weakest points, namely, in her outlying possessions. If we acquire colonies, the first attack upon us will be through them. As long as you have a compact territory no nation will dare invade it, because nothing can be made thereby. There is no way of holding a slice of territory cut from a nation located such as ours. Sooner or later it would be retaken. When nations find that nothing can be gained by war with such a country the idea of conquest vanishes even if they covet our possessions. We should not exchange concentration for diffusion.

We have heard much in this debate of England's greatness. England is great, but not to be compared to the United States. On account of her small home territory, England could not have a large population without colonial possessions, but we have a territory so large in area that it can easily accommodate ten times its present inhabitants without overcrowding. But even British

statesmen have doubted the wisdom of that country having colonial possessions. Mr. Gladstone once said:

The United States have a national base for the greatest continuous empire ever established by man. * * * The distinction between a continuous empire and one severed and dispersed over the seas is vital.

Even India has been a source of depleting the British treasury, and it is said in England that, more than any other part of the British Empire, India gives their statesmen sleepless nights. Besides, England is continually at war with her provinces in suppressing uprisings and revolts, at the expense of her treasury.

The United States need have no fear of the outcome of a contest with any foreign power. Great Britain is the only dangerous power, and her outlying dominions make her so vulnerable that she dare not attack us. Even if her navy is larger than ours, she realizes that the minute war is declared the armies of the United States would cross the Canadian borders and wrest from her grasp the gem of her colonial possessions. Canada is our hostage and is a sure preventive of war.

When the Hawaiian Islands are annexed, the point of attack by any foreign power will be there, because it is so far from our strength and power. There they can meet us on equal terms, and it will make our wars of the future contests upon the high seas instead of upon the land, where our great natural strength lies.

Why should we throw away our natural strength—land power—in order to grasp that which is expensive and not necessary to us—sea power?

The Hawaiian Islands have a coast line of over 800 miles—as large as that of New England. If we annex them, they must be fortified and defended. It puts the outposts of our defense 2,100 miles into the Pacific. As we know it will be the point of attack in case of war with foreign powers, it must be fortified more strongly than the other portions of our country. It means, therefore, the expenditure of millions in fortifications and an unnecessarily large navy.

WOULD THE POSSESSION OF HAWAII BY ANY OTHER NATION BE
DANGEROUS TO US?

But gentlemen say it is no longer a question as to whether we shall own the islands, but whether we can permit any other nation to own them, and that if we do not take them some other nation will.

Mr. Speaker, I have no apprehension that any other nation will ever own them or that even if they should they could be a menace to us.

Some gentlemen talk as if it would mean annihilation to the United States if a foreign power should get possession of the islands. So greatly have they magnified this feature of the de-

bate that one might imagine that the very existence of our nation was threatened if some other nation should have a coaling station there.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the greatest naval power on earth to-day has a naval and coaling station within 100 miles of the two leading cities of Seattle and Tacoma. On Vancouver Island Great Britain has not only a coaling station, but a great naval establishment. Our naval and military men have not spent any sleepless nights in anticipation of total annihilation from such a source. Great Britain has a number of coaling stations on islands in the Atlantic close to our shore, and yet we do not have any nightmares over that fact.

Do you suppose that Great Britain, even if she owned the Sandwich Islands, would go out into the middle of the Pacific Ocean and from there attempt to send her battle ships against our shore? She, like all other nations, would find that the Hawaiian Islands are too far from our shore to act as a base of supplies or naval establishment for repairs. Very little more coal can be stored in a battle ship than that which is necessary to carry it to our shores. By the time a hostile battle ship reached our shores from Honolulu she would be almost out of coal, and hence not in condition to enter an engagement. If there were delay, her ships would be as helpless as sail vessels to resist or escape from our armament.

HAWAII NOT A NATURAL COALING STATION.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about Hawaii being a coaling station. It is not naturally a coaling station, because no coal is found on the island. For through commerce it is not a coaling station. I was told by Senator PETTIGREW, who came back from China by that route, that merchant ships do not coal at Honolulu. He said that at the ports of China you can buy coal for \$7 a ton, but when you reach Honolulu it costs \$14 per ton. Consequently it pays to take a sufficient quantity of coal to last to San Francisco, so as not to coal at Honolulu. The very statement of the reason must carry conviction. There may be some coaling at Honolulu, but it must be very small.

Why should we desire even a coaling station at Hawaii when it is 800 miles out of the way in going from San Francisco to Yokohama, or the Chinese ports? In measuring distance on the globe it must be remembered that the earth rounds to the north.

We already own the Aleutian Islands, which are within 75 miles of the direct line of travel to Japan and China. Those islands contain coal and hence are natural coaling stations. The island of Kiska, in that group, contains a magnificent harbor and in my judgment has a far greater strategic position than any harbor in Hawaii. We are apt to think of our Aleutian Islands as

being frigid and unfit for harbor purposes, but when we are assured that the thermometer never gets below 7° above zero, and also realize that Kiska is situated south of the latitude of the greatest port in the world, Liverpool, we can realize that there is no danger of ice obstructing navigation for a single day in the year.

The route from San Francisco to Yokohama is three days shorter by our own islands than by Honolulu, and from the ports of Seattle and Tacoma the time is still shorter. I am informed that ships do not go by Honolulu, unless they have sufficient local business at that port to justify the loss of three days in the voyage.

Why should we be grasping for that which is out of the way when we should be developing the islands and shore line we already possess?

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULZER. You are opposed to the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULZER. But you have not said what you would do with those islands.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state in response to the gentleman what I think is the best thing to do with the Hawaiian Islands. I believe that a policy recognizing their independence is all that is necessary; they will not attempt to annex their country to any other, and no other government will ever seek to acquire those islands. Now, let me go into detail a little on the subject.

Mr. SULZER. Then you are in favor of this Government pursuing with regard to the Hawaiian Islands a "dog-in-the-manger" policy, saying, "We do not want them, and we will not let anybody else have them."

Mr. SHAFROTH. They do not want to go to any other country.

Mr. SULZER. How do you know that?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Every test shows that it is true. Senator PETTIGREW was at a meeting in the Hawaiian Islands, and undertook to find out whether those who attended that meeting had signed a remonstrance against annexation even to this country; and every man rose and said he was opposed to annexation.

Mr. SULZER. Suppose those islands should desire to maintain their independence, but at some future time should be seized by Great Britain or France, as they have been in the past, what would this country do?

HAWAIIAN INDEPENDENCE GUARANTEED.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will attempt to answer that. There was a treaty made between England and France at the instance of Daniel Webster, when he was Secretary of State, which pro-

vides that they shall never acquire an inch of territory of the Hawaiian Islands. That treaty stands in the way. There has been no effort on the part of either of them to acquire these islands, and with that treaty standing there it seems to me that there is no possibility that the islands will ever be acquired by either of those nations.

Mr. SULZER. Right there. In case of war do treaties stand?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, that when there is an interest of the United States that backs up the provisions of a treaty, there is no country on the face of the globe that will disregard it. No, Mr. Speaker, there is no danger of these islands going to any other nation.

I hold in my hand a copy of the treaty referred to, which I ask to incorporate as a part of my remarks:

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and His Majesty the King of the French, taking into consideration the existence in the Sandwich Islands of a Government capable of providing for the regularity of its relations with foreign nations, have thought it right to engage reciprocally to consider the Sandwich Islands as an independent State and never taken possession, either directly or under the title of a protectorate, or under any other form, of any part of the territory of which they are composed.

The undersigned, her Britannic Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, and the ambassador extraordinary of His Majesty the King of the French at the court of London, being furnished with the necessary power, hereby declare in consequence that their said majesties take reciprocally that engagement.

In witness whereof the undersigned have signed the present declaration and have affixed thereto the seals of their arms.

Done in duplicate at London the 23th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1843.

ABERDEEN. [L. S.]

ST. AULAIRE. [L. S.]

Why, Mr. Speaker, European nations are continually asserting that independence shall be accorded to such and such a republic. You remember the little Republic of San Marino, in the Pyrenees, between France and Spain, which has a standing army of, I think, eleven men. It has been protected for hundreds of years by treaty provisions of the European powers. It is sanctioned by the doctrine of the balance of power, concerning which every European nation has a right to make treaty stipulations, and that is the reason they have recognized in our Government the right to dictate as to territorial possessions in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. BRUCKER. Your judgment is that the Hawaiian Government gets the best end of things under the present reciprocity treaty with Hawaii?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Decidedly.

Mr. BRUCKER. Is it your judgment that that treaty should continue?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is a question which depends entirely upon how much importance we attach to the military station.

Mr. BRUCKER. Pearl Harbor?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Pearl Harbor. I do not believe as a matter of fact that the right to Pearl Harbor depends upon this treaty. It may be wise to continue it or it may not. Reciprocity was a policy of this Government for awhile and seemed to go to the extent of taking this in. I doubt very much—

Mr. BRUCKER. Supposing our right to use Pearl Harbor to depend upon reciprocity, would you still be in favor of the repeal of the treaty?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That would depend entirely upon whether or not complications were likely to arise as to annexation to any other country. I do not regard that naval station there as of the importance that some gentlemen here do.

Mr. LOVE. Do you regard it as of absolute importance as a coaling station?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not regard it as a necessity to this Government. I believe that those who think that ships are going to come from the Hawaiian Islands, a distance of 2,100 miles, to attack our shores are mistaken in the mode of warfare of modern times.

Mr. Speaker, they would never have a supply of coal that far off. They would get it somewhere else. They would go to Mexico and buy a coaling station on the peninsula of Lower California, if they could not get it in any other way. If they could not buy, they would seize it as a military necessity; at least, they would never resort to the Hawaiian Islands, because, when they coaled there, they would not have more than enough coal to last them until they got to our western coast; and when they met our ships, if they were engaged in battle for any considerable length of time, they would be out of coal, perfectly helpless, and at the mercy of our fleet.

Mr. FLEMING. Is it not also true that the possession of the Hawaiian Islands by the United States would really be a point of military weakness to our Government until we had spent money enough on them to fortify them and make them impregnable against outside attack?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that they would be nothing but a source of weakness to us, unless we are willing to undertake the policy of building a navy twice or three times as large as that which we naturally should have.

OUR TITLE TO PEARL HARBOR.

But even if Hawaii possessed all the strategical advantage claimed, there would be no reason for annexation. We already own the only easily defended harbor to be found on those islands. Pearl



Harbor is ours by grant, and no nation can take it from us. The wording of the treaty is so plain that it seems to me no one can doubt our title. It reads as follows:

His Majesty, the King of the Hawaiian Islands, grants to the Government of the United States the exclusive right to enter the harbor of Pearl River in the Island of Oahu, and to establish and maintain there a coaling and repair station for the use of vessels of the United States; and to that end the United States may improve the entrance to said harbor and do all other things needful to the purpose aforesaid.

Senator Sherman has contended that the grant was drawn by Senator Edmunds and that its author had stated over and over again that it was as absolute a conveyance as any language could make it. Inasmuch as Senator Edmunds is one of the most distinguished lawyers in this country, his word ought to be given great consideration in the construction of this contract.

Is it possible that for remittance of duties on sugar to the amount of \$65,000,000 we have obtained nothing?

Would any sane man agree to establish a coaling station and repair establishment, with the permanent improvements and buildings necessary and with all the durable fortifications essential to maintain the same, and be subject to notice to quit? Would we agree to improve the entrance to Pearl Harbor, which would take thousands and thousands of dollars, for the purpose of surrendering it on one year's notice? The word grant is used, and there is no provision limiting the time of the same.

Pearl Harbor is ours, and hence we have all the strategical advantage it affords. That is the only easily defended harbor in those islands. With that harbor in our possession, what inducement would there be for any foreign nation to annex those islands? None whatever.

I therefore contend that there is no strategical advantage to this country in the Hawaiian Islands: but even if there were, we already own the only strategical point of the islands.

Mr. Speaker, there are few questions that so vitally affect the welfare and happiness of the American people as that of reversing the policy under which our nation has prospered to a degree hitherto unknown in the history of the world and adopting one of colonial acquisitions, with its attendant imperial policy. Impartial history records the downfall of every nation that ever undertook to realize the dream of universal empire. Let us profit by the example.

DU 627

·4

·S 4

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 961 076 4

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5